Medical University of South Carolina

Sector: Research Institutions

1999-2000 Performance Year Score

86%

2.59 out of a Maximum of 3.00

ACHIEVES STANDARDS

See Interpreting Scores at bottom of page

Performance Score Summary

Total Applicable Indicators (incl. 2 now assessed within other indicators.) 30 Indicators Exceeded Standards (or received scores of 3) on 9 Indicators Achieved Standards (or received scores of 2.00-2.99) on 6 Indicators Did Not Achieve Standards (or received scores of 1.00-1.99) on 1 Indicators Achieved Compliance (or received scores of "Complied") on 6 Indicators Evaluated in Years Other Than Performance Year 1999-00 6 Indicators

MUSC At A Glance

Raymond S. Greenberg, President

171 Ashley Avenue

17% of headcnt Minority

Charleston, SC 29425 Founded in 1824

(843) 792-2300 For link to institution's mission. www.musc.edu see www.che400.state.sc.us and

select "Performance Funding"



2.383 Headcount **Full-Time** 908 incl. those holding academic rank & incl. full & part 18% of headcnt Undergraduate primary assignment of instruction, Faculty time students research or public service. (IPEDS) 83% of headcnt from SC at entry

Full-Time 1,985 (83% of headcnt) **Tuition** \$4,626 In State, Full-Time Student \$12,959 Out of State, Full-Time Student Academic Year

SAT N/A (1st-time entering freshmen, 1999-00 (incl. required tuition and fees, incl_converted ACT scores) IPEDS Inst. Characteristics Survey) Average

Degrees N/A Associates **Financial** \$236.8 Total Revenue, excl. auxiliary

Dollars In Millions Awarded 295 Bachelor's \$323.9 Total Educ. & General Expend. FY 1998-99 154 Master's FY 1998-99

excl. auxiliary 194 First Professional (IPEDS Finance Survey) 0 Specialist

(Fall 1999 data unless noted otherwise) 29 Doctoral

Interpreting Scores

Comparing the average score on applicable indicators to the maximum 3.00 possible produces the percentage score shown in the upper right hand column. Institutions within the same sector whose percentage is in the same range as shown below are considered to to be performing at similar levels.

If Percent or Overall Score Range is:

Performance Category is: 95% to 100% or 2.85 to 3.00 Substantially Exceeds 87% to 94% or 2.60 to 2.84 Exceeds 67% to 86% or 2.00 to 2.59 Achieves 48% to 66% or 1.45 to 1.99 Does Not Achieve 33% to 47% or 1.00 to 1.44 Substantially Does Not Achieve

SC Commission on Higher Education's Ratings for the 1999-00 Performance Year to impact Fiscal Year 2000-01 Approved May 4, 2000. Report prepared by the Commission's Division of Planning, Assessment & Perf. Funding 1333 Main St., Suite 200 * Columbia, SC 29201 * (803) 737-2260 * www.che400.state.sc.us

MUSC

EY TO SCORING

PERFORMANCE FUNDING IN SC: "Performance Funding" began in SC with the ratification of Act 359 of 1996, effective July 1, 1996. Act 359 required that the State's coordinating board for higher education (SC Commission on Higher Education or "CHE") measure annually each public institution's performance in various areas and base allocation of state appropriated dollars on performance. A 3-year, phase-in period was provided for CHE to design a system that translated indicators specified in legislation to measures and to provide a process translating performance to dollars. CHE worked with the business and higher education communities to design the current system which has evolved since its initial conceptualization. During the phase-in period as the system and indicators were defined, only selected indicators were used to determine a percentage of dollars received. Last year, CHE determined each institution's allocation for FY 1999-00 based on performance. The system continues to undergo refinements as measures and data are better understood. In the years ahead, standards set for SC's institutions will continue to increase in an effort to ensure and improve the quality of SC's public institutions of higher education so they will be globally competitive.

For the 1999-00 performance year, the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) rated each institution's performance on a set of measures approved by the CHE. Scores of 1 to 3 were awarded for performance on indicators or indicator subparts based on standards set last spring. Some standards were set by institutions and approved by CHE while others were set by CHE and were the same for all institutions. CHE, in limited cases, scored performance based on institutional appeals during the scoring process.

The range required for an institution to receive a score of 2 is shown below. Because of the method used to set standards, this range varies across indicators and institutions. Indicators where CHE considered an appeal and awarded scores based on that appeal rather than the range are noted. Applicable indicators for an institution depend on the institution's sector mission and individual characteristics as indicators are defined similarly for all institutions. To determine the overall score, the scores on applicable indicators are averaged. For indicators with multiple subparts, the subparts are scored and then averaged together to produce a single indicator score that contributes to the overall score. If the score for an indicator or subpart is:

- 3 The institution "Exceeds" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions or is at or above a standard identified to indicate a level beyond which continuous improvement is not expected.
- 2 The institution "Achieves" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions as indicated by the ranges shown below.
- 1 The institution "Does Not Achieve" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions.

Indicators Requiring Compliance - Some indicators require that an institution comply with a set of practices or policies. If an institution is in compliance the performance is scored "Complied" and no numeric score contributes to the final average. If an institution fails to comply, the institution receives a score of 1 for noncompliance. Indicators "On Cycle" - Some indicators are assessed at two or three year intervals.

critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title		(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O	1999-00 Performance Score		
			Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	(1 if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator	
14	of ge Se	ands expended to achieve mission based on ratio expenditure category to total educational and eneral expenditures. Expend. Category is "Public ervice"	(FY 98-99)	8.2%	7.6%	7.7% to	7.3%	(1)		2.00
1E	the su red	urricula offered to achieve mission measured as e % of programs appropriate to degree level, apported by mission, & with full approval in most cent CHE program review.	(Spring 2000)	Not Avail	97%	95% to 99% or r one not ap				2.00
10	on	oproval of a mission statement. CHE approves ace every 5 years with changes being assessed in e interim.	(initial '98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance score of 1 is				Complied
10) Ac	doption of a strategic plan.	(FY 98-99)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance score of 1 is				Complied
1E	At	tainment of strategic plan goals.	(FY 97-98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance score of 1 is				Complied
24	A Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors : 3.00								3.00	
	1	% headcount faculty teaching undergrads meeting Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools requirements	(Fall 1999)	100.0%	100.0%	97.0% to	99.9%	(2)	3	
	2a	% headcount faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses.	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	N/A, Compliance this year only (r			Complied	
	2 b	% full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	that required coll during this			Complied	
2E	2	aculty performance review system. Assessed very 3 years.		90%	On Cycle	Not assessed Assessed next in	,			On Cycle
20	•	aculty post tenure review system. Assessed every years.		67%	On Cycle	Not assessed Assessed next in				On Cycle
20) Av	verage faculty compensation by rank :		-						2.75
	1a	Instructor	(Fall 1999)	\$39,181	\$43,136	\$34,680 to	\$35,029	(2)	3	
	1b	Assistant Professor	(Fall 1999)	\$46,110	\$45,513	\$40,122 to	\$45,087	(2)	3	
	1c	: Associate Professor	(Fall 1999)	\$50,872	\$52,816	\$46,856 to	\$52,654	(2)	3	
	1d	I Professor	(Fall 1999)	\$68,911	\$68,961	\$65,628 to	\$73,749	(2)	2	

NOTES:

- (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.
- (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 2A1=100%; 2D1a=\$35,030; 2D1b=\$50,152; 2D1c=\$58,570; and 2D1d=\$82,035

MUSC Performance Year 1999-00

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title		(Time Period	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O		9-00 nce Score		
		Measured This Yr)	Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	(I if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator		
' ')	2E	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroo	m as based	on standard	survey que:	stions:				On Cycle	
QUALIIY OF FACULTY (con't)		% classroom faculty rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.		81%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next i			On Cycle		
UALI ULTY		 % advisors rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years. 		80%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next i	•		On Cycle		
G FAC	2F	Community and public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid. This measure has been incorporated into the measurement of Indicator 2B.									
	3A	Class size and student /teacher ratios : (Expected Ranges for 3A)								2.00	
		1a lower division class size	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A				
		1b upper division class size	(Fall 1999)	30.7	23.8	20 to	30		in range		
		2a % undergrad lecture sections of 50 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.0%	0% to	20%				
		2b % lower division lecture of 100 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	N/A	N/A to	N/A		in range		
ΤΥ		3 FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	(Fall 1999)	9.6	10.1	14 to	19		out of range		
CLASSROOM QUALITY	3B	Average # credit hours taught by full-time faculty teaching at least 3 hours.	(Fall 1999)	165	146	160 to	170	(2)	range	1.00	
S W	3C	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees.	(Fall 1999)	43.2%	45.9%	28.7% to	29.5%	(2)		3.00	
ROC	3D	Accreditation of degree granting programs.	(Spring 2000)	100%	100%	90% to 99% progr		(3)		3.00	
(5)	3E	Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education a	nd reform :							N/A	
CLA		1 NCATE accreditation	(Spring 2000)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ą		N/A		
		% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Professional Knowledge	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A		
		2b % students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Specialty Area Exams	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A		
		3a % teacher ed. grads in critical shortage areas	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A		
		3b % teacher ed. grads who are minority	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A		
OLLABORATION	4A	Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and/or with the business community. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.				On Cycle	
COLLA	4B	Cooperation and collaboration with private industry. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next i	,			On Cycle	
	5A	Ratio of administrative expenditures to academic expenditures, expressed as a %.	(FY 98-99)	7.8%	9.5%	10.6% to	10.4%	(1) (2)		3.00	
EFFICIENCY	5B	Assessed every 2 years.		100%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	,			On Cycle	
EFFICIENCY	5C	Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs. Assessed every 3 years.	(FY 99-00)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance score of 1 is				Complied	
	5D	General overhead expenditures per full-time equivalent student.	(FY 98-99)	\$9,152	\$10,094	\$10,826 to	\$10,196	(1) (2)		3.00	
TS	6A	SAT scores of entering freshmen, % with 1000 SAT/20 ACT or higher.	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A	
MEN	6В	% entering freshmen with high school rank in ton	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A	
REQUIREMENTS	6C	Policy for considering post-secondary non- academic achievements of non-traditional students, compliance with CHE guidelines.	(as of Spring 2000)	N/A	N/A	N/.	Α			N/A	
RE	6D	Priority on enrolling in-state students, based on those considered in-state for fee purposes.	(Fall 1999)	95.8%	98.1%	67.9% to	69.9%	(2)		3.00	
VOTE		those considered in-state for fee purposes. (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance									

NOTES: See last page for notes after (3).

⁽¹⁾ A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

⁽²⁾ A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 3B=220*; 3C=29.6%; 5A=10.3%; 5D=\$1,624; 6D=70% (* temporary level approved for current year)

⁽³⁾ Percentage reflects both programs accredited and on track for accreditation to be awarded by April 2002.

MUSC Performance Year 1999-00

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number /			(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O	1999-00 Performance Score	
escriptive Measurement Title		Prior Yr '98-99		This Yr '99-00	(I if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator	
	7A	Graduation rate :								N/A
		1 150% of program time, considers 1st-time, full-time, degree-seeking students.	1993 cohort	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
		150% of program time, excluding those enrolled in 2 or more developmental courses 1st semester (applies to Tech Colleges only).	same cohort as 7A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
	7B	Employment and education rate for graduates (Asses	ssed every 2	years) :		3				Complied
ENTS		system for tracking undergraduates on employment or continued education with response rate of 20%		Not Avail	Complied		ance required or a 1 is awarded.		Complied	
EVEM		2 % graduates either employed or enrolled at a more advanced level		Not Avail	On Cycle	collected. V	ed while data is Will be assessed		On Cycle	
GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS		3 % graduates employed within 1 year		Not Avail	On Cycle	starting with F	1 every 2 years Performance Year 999-00.		On Cycle	
S	7C	Employer feedback on graduates (Assessed every 2	years) :							Complied
UATE		1 process for surveying employers who interview or hire prospective graduates		Not Avail	Complied	score of	ance required or a 1 is awarded.		Complied	
SRAD		employers' level of satisfaction with graduates interviewed		Not Avail	On Cycle	collected. V	sed while data is Will be assessed I every 2 years		On Cycle	
		3 employers' satisfaction with employees		Not Avail	On Cycle	starting with F	Performance Year 999-00.		On Cycle	
	7D	% of students passing professional examinations.	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	91.9%	91.8%	88.4%	to 93.8%			2.00
	7E	Number of graduates continuing their education. This		as been inco	orporated int	to the measure	ement of Indicator	7B.		T
	7F	Average credit hours earned compared to average required for program completed of students earning bachelor's degrees.	(Degrees earned in 1998-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A			N/A
	8 A	Transferability of credits to and from the institution (extent of compliance with CHE guidelines)	(Spring 2000)	83%	100%	97%	to 100%	(2)		3.00
	8B	Continuing education programs for graduates and others measured as total CEU's produced in FY. Applicable if CEU production >= 1000.	(FY 98-99)	15,800	29,000	19,200	to 20,400			3.00
9	8C	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state	e:							2.75
INSTITUTION		wno are minority (neadcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	15.0%	11.6%	to 12.4%	(2)	3	
Z		undergrads who are minority.	(Fall '98 to Fall '99)	Not Avail	89.9%	84.9%	to 84.9%	(2)	3	
		3 % graduate students who are minority (headcount) % teaching faculty who are minority	(Fall 1999)	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%	to 17.0%		2	
		4 (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	6.4%	4.6%	to 4.8%		3	
SING	9A		(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A			N/A
FUNDING	9B	Public and private sector grants measured as FY restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-yr Average. (Applicable if >= \$1 million in annual expenditures)	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	102.4%	123.4%	95%	to 104%			3.00
nary	Ва	ased on data in the far right column, "1999-00 Perf Applicable Indicators 30 (including two that are a Exceeded standards (scores of 3) on 9 indicators	ssessed w		ndicators).	# of ind	Subtotal icators averaged		41.50 16	
Summary		Achieved Standards (scores of 3) on 9 indicators Achieved Standards (scores of 2.00 to 2.99) on 6 Did Not Achieve Standards (scores of 1.00 to 1.9 Achieved Compliance on 6 indicators. 6 indicators	6 indicators 99) on 1 in	dicators.	-	Ave	Average rage / 3.00 Max Category is	:	2.59 86% ACHIEVES	

NOTES: (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

⁽²⁾ A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 8A=100%; 8C1=28.7%; and 8C2=85%* (* temporary level approved for current year)